

**REMARKS**

Applicant submits that the present amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated November 12, 2008 and, thus, the application is in condition for allowance.

By this reply, claims 2, 7, and 9 are amended. Claims 2 - 13 remain pending. Of these, claims 2, 7, and 9 are independent. An expedited review and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 2-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by de Gregorio et al. (US Pub. No. 2007/0127495). It is asserted that de Gregorio discloses a device and method with all of the features of the present invention as recited in the pending claims. The Office Action refers to certain parts of de Gregorio that allegedly recite and disclose the specific elements as recited in the pending claims, thereby arguing that de Gregorio renders the present invention as anticipated. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither de Gregorio nor any other reference, alone or in combination, anticipate or obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claim. De Gregorio suffers from a number of shortcomings. For example, de Gregorio fails to teach or suggest authenticating a subscriber for access to a first requested service based upon receiving a code from a terminal device at the time a request for the requested service is made, the code indicating that a unique username and password will not be provided by the terminal device, as well as authenticating the subscriber for access to a second requested service based upon receiving the code and the IP address from the first requested service. This can be found, for example, in paragraph [0047] of the disclosure and is present in the device and method of the independent claims. De Gregorio discloses a single sign-on for a mobile network (Paragraph [0053]). However, after the initial sign-on of de Gregorio, any authentication thereafter is accomplished solely by the network,

without the device. In the present invention, when a user wishes to use a service, the user requests the service on their terminal. Along with this request, the terminal sends a code specifying that a unique username and password will not be used. There is no such code sent from the terminal in de Gregorio. De Gregorio authenticates any service the user attempts to use. This may not be the user's desire as the user may only wish to use the code for certain services and wish to have to sign in for others, not possible under de Gregorio. Furthermore, the present invention allows the first requested service to authenticate the user with a second requested service by sending the code and IP address of the user's terminal from the first requested service to the second requested service. De Gregorio does not disclose any such element. This element allows the first requested service to utilize the second requested service, for example, when the first requested service needs to enlist the services of the second requested service. An example of this is when an e-mail service needs to utilize the services of a streaming video provider when an e-mail contains a video attachment. The first requested service can directly communicate the authentication to the second requested service without having to query the service provider network elements, as seen in de Gregorio. Because these elements, features and capabilities are not present in de Gregorio, the present invention cannot be anticipated. For at least these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because de Gregorio does not teach all of the elements in the independent claims, the dependent claims, which depend therefrom, also are patentably distinct from any prior art of record. For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 2 - 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Du et al. (US Pat. No. 6,981,152) in view of Barriga-Caceres et al. (U.S. Pat. No 7,221,935). It is asserted that Du discloses a device and method with all of the features

of the present invention as recited in the claims except for “authenticating a subscriber for access to a requested service based upon receiving a code from a terminal device.” It is further asserted that Barriga-Caceres discloses this deficiency, and thus it would have been obvious to combine the references to obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Applicant respectfully traverses.

With respect to claim 2, 7 and 9, neither Du nor Barriga-Caceres, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. For example, Du does not disclose or suggest authenticating a subscriber for access to a first requested service based upon receiving a code from a terminal device at the time a request for the requested service is made, the code indicating that a unique username and password will not be provided by the terminal device, as well as authenticating the subscriber for access to a second requested service based upon receiving the code and the IP address from the first requested service. Either this element or a comparable element is found in each of the independent claims. Du discloses providing a user with exclusive access to his computer and secure logins into networks and Web sites via a smart card (Column 4, Lines 6-8). At most, Du teaches logging onto a network. Du does not disclose sending any type of code and IP address to indicate that a unique username and password will not be provided by the terminal. This element is simply not present and is not rendered obvious simply by a SIM card which logs a user on. Furthermore, the present invention allows the first requested service to authenticate the user with a second requested service by sending the code and IP address of the user’s terminal from the first requested service to the second requested service. Any signing in found in Du is accomplished by the SIM card.

Furthermore, Barriga-Caceres fails to cure the deficiencies of Du because Barriga-Caceres also fails to teach or disclose authenticating a subscriber for access to a first requested service based upon receiving a code from a terminal device at the time a request for the requested service is made, the code indicating that a unique username and password will not be provided by the terminal device, as well as authenticating the subscriber for access to a second requested service based upon receiving the code and the IP address from the first requested service. Barriga-Caceres discloses a single sign-on service (Column 4, Lines 35-40). At most, Barriga-Caceres provides for the authentication of a device. However, Barriga-Caceres does not provide for any code to be sent from a terminal at the time of request from a service in order to authenticate the terminal. Any authentication in Barriga-Caceres is done at the initial sign-on of the device. Barriga-Caceres therefore authenticates any service the user attempts to use. This may not be the user's desire as the user may only wish to use the code for certain services and wish to have to sign in for others, not possible under Barriga-Caceres. Furthermore, the present invention allows the first requested service to authenticate the user with a second requested service by sending the code and IP address of the user's terminal from the first requested service to the second requested service. Barriga-Caceres does not disclose any such element. This element allows the first requested service to utilize the second requested service, for example, when the first requested service needs to enlist the services of the second requested service. The first requested service can directly communicate the authentication to the second requested service without having to query the service provider network elements, as seen in Barriga-Caceres. Because this element is not present in Barriga-Caceres, Barriga-Caceres cannot render the present invention obvious. For at least these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because neither Du nor Barriga-Caceres, alone or in combination, teach all of the elements in the independent claims, the dependent claims, which depend therefrom, also are patentably distinct from any prior art of record. For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Furthermore, there is no motivation to combine any of these references outside of Applicant's own disclosure. Even if they were combinable, *arguendo*, the combination would not be able to obviate the present invention for at least the reasons set forth above. Thus, the rejection of the claims should be withdrawn.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary to enter this amendment. If any fees are associated with the entering and consideration of this amendment, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account 50-2882.

Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner to present more evidence of the unique attributes of the present invention in person. As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 11, 2009

/Fariborz Moazzam, Reg. No. 53,339/

Fariborz Moazzam

Reg. No. 53,339

Cust. No. 39,013

MOAZZAM & ASSOCIATES, LLC

7601 Lewinsville Road, Suite 304

McLean, VA 22102

(703) 442-9480; (703) 991-5978 (fax)